

Gansner 1999-0730

### REMARKS

FIGS. 1 and 7 were objected to because they allegedly fail to show necessary textual labels. FIGs. 1 and 7 are amended to overcome the objection by removing features that are not necessary for the full understanding of the invention and which, apparently, the Examiner found detrimental to the full understanding of the figures. As amended, it is believed that the FIGS. are in compliance with 37 CFR 1.83. The Examiner's approval of the amended drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, and 8-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Peters, US Patent 5,715,334, in view of Burfeind et al, US Patent 6,052,648. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner asserts that Peters discloses a visualization interface, a plurality of processing tools, and "means for streaming data to one or more of the processing tools...." In support of the latter assertion, the Examiner points to FIG. 23 and col. 29, lines 22-65. Applicants respectfully disagree.

FIG. 23 shows a multiplicity of images and, by itself, teaches nothing relative to how the images were created. The cited text makes reference to PAIP (which stands for Pixel Accurate Intensity Processing), but there is no notion in the cited text of "streaming the data," as the fourth clause of claim 1 specifies. A reference to an online dictionary of terms in the art ([www.webopedia.com](http://www.webopedia.com)) identifies streaming as

A technique for transferring data such that it can be processed as a steady and continuous stream. Streaming technologies are becoming increasingly important with the growth of the Internet because most users do not have fast enough access to download large multimedia files quickly. With streaming, the client browser or plug-in can start displaying the data before the entire file has been transmitted.

Again, no such notion is present in the text cited by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the Examiner's assertion relative to the fourth clause of claim 1 fails.

With reference to the third clause of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Burfeind et al teach means for accessing data in a self-describing format. In support of this assertion the Examiner cites FIGS. 5, 6 and 9, as well as the text at col. 5, lines 2-13. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Gansner 1999-0730

FIGS. 5, 6, and 9 offer images that are explained in the cited text of col. 5, lines 1-13, which states:

Referring back to FIG. 9, after a virtual set has been generated by video camera 44, and a chroma-key mask has been generated by chroma-key device 58, both of these signals are fed into the real-time texture map device 60. The mask output of device 58 is input as the alpha input (shown in FIG. 6), and the video feed output of camera 44 is input as the video inputs (shown in FIG. 5). The texture map device 60 converts those parts of the video feed that correspond to the on color of the alpha input to a texture memory, which is a digital representation of the weather forecaster stored in the memory of the computer in a format having the ability to be manipulated by the graphics processors of the computer.

The only reference to a "format" that is found in the cited passage is that the digital representation of the weather forecaster is stored in memory "in a format having the ability to be manipulated...." Respectfully, that does NOT teach or suggest a self-describing format. It simply teaches that the digital representation in the file is in a format (somehow made known) such that the data can be manipulated. Of course, any file having data at a known format inherently allows manipulation of the data, so this clarification by the reference is quite trivial.

In contradistinction, the notion of data being characterized by a "self-describing format" clearly requires that the format of the data be such that there is something present in the data that is (a) descriptive (b) of the data's format.

Since the data stored in the memory of Burfeind et al's arrangement is NOT in a "self-describing format," it follows that the Examiner's assertion relative to the third clause of claim 1 fails.

Since the combination of the Peters reference and the Burfeind et al reference does not teach or suggest the third and fourth clauses of claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the Peters and Burfeind et al combination. For similar reasons, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 8 is also not obvious in view of the Peters and Burfeind et al combination.

The above notwithstanding, in order to better define the invention claims 1 and 8 are amended herein. As amended, claim 1 defines the "means for accessing" as a

means for accessing a plurality of data files that had been converted to a uniform self-describing format (emphasis supplied)

Gansner 1999-0730

This adds the notion of (a) the data being in files, (b) a plurality of data files, and (c) the files being all in the same format. Moreover, the ability to handle data files that had arrived with different formats is included in the phrase "had been converted to...." None of these notions are taught or suggested in the cited references.

Amended claim 1 also defines a means for streaming as a

means that enables streaming the data to and through one or more of said processing tools to create data results for updating one or more objects, which one or more objects may be displayed by the visualization interface.

This explicitly adds the notion of enabling the streaming through more than one processing tools, and the notion that the subject matter displayed by the visualization interface is "objects" that are updated by data created by virtue of the work performed by the processing tools. None of these notions are taught or suggested in either of the cited references.

Claim 8 is amended in a manner not dissimilar from the amendment to claim 1 and, consequently, applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1 and 8 even more clearly distinguish over the prior art.

Inasmuch as claims 1 and 8 (the only independent claims) are believed to be not obvious in view of the Peters and Burfeind et al combination of references, it is respectfully submitted that all of the remaining claims are also not obvious in view of the Peters and Burfeind et al combination of references.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103 in view of the Peters and Burfeind et al combination of references, and further in view of allegedly admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that for the reasons expressed above, claim 7 is not obvious in view of any combination of known art.

Gansner 1999-0730

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicants believe that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-14 are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,  
Emden Gansner  
Eleftherios Koutsofios  
Stephen Charles North  
Russell N. Pruscott

Dated: 11/18/03

By 

Henry T. Brendzel  
Reg. No. 26,844  
Phone (973) 467-2025  
Fax (973) 467-6589  
email [brendzel@comcast.net](mailto:brendzel@comcast.net)